



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/687,784	10/17/2003	Gaurav Singh	RZMI-P0310-US	9860
92889	7590	09/15/2010	EXAMINER	
Vista IP Law Group LLP 1885 Lundy Avenue Suite 108 San Jose, CA 95131			ANDREWS, LEON T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2462	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/15/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/687,784	Applicant(s) SINGH ET AL.	
	Examiner LEON ANDREWS	Art Unit 2462	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 August 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-2, 4, 6-9 and 27-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-2, 4, 6-9 and 27-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 21 and 23-25 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

RCE

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on August 27, 2010 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2, 4, 6-9 and 27-28 are being rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Wong (Pub. No.: 2004/0264464 A1 using Provisional application No.: 60/482,759) in view of

Art Unit: 2462

Tang et al. (Patent No.: US 6,553,028 B1), Fig. 1 of the Admitted Prior Art in the Background of the application (Pub. No.: US 2005/0083839 A1) and Herriot (Patent Number: 5,929,792).

Regarding Claim 1 (as best understood), Wong discloses a multicast packet duplication system for multicast packets (Internet Protocol Multicast (IPMC) packet duplication covers tables required to implement the MMU and egress module, page 3, lines 2-4) containing at least multicast address data (multicast packet is replaced with source MAC address, page 3, lines 14-15), comprising:

an input port (Block Diagram, CPI ingress bus, page STN-2) configured to receive a packet (IPMC packet, page 5, line 21);

a pointer table (ECMP Support, LPM table, page STN-7) having a width comprising a plurality of entries (ECMP Support, LPM table, page STN-7; ECMP Dest_Ip, steps 2 and 3, LPM table with ip addresses, page STN-8) coupled to a linked-list table (ECMP Support, L3 table, page STN-7; steps 6 and 7, L3_table_index, index points to entry of 8 entries in the L3 table); and a plurality of output ports configured to output the packet, wherein

a number of duplications of the packet for each of at least some of the plurality of output ports is controlled by descriptors arranged in a linked-list table and is duplicated on a per port basis by duplicating the number of duplications on at least one of the plurality of output ports rather than by the duplicating on all the plurality of output ports,

at least one of the one or more descriptor is shared among multiple output ports of the plurality of output ports, and an encoding format for the descriptors include at least one of:

a contiguous range encoding that includes a starting indicator and an ending indicator for a first set of the one of more descriptors within the contiguous range;

a non-contiguous range encoding that includes information or data of a most significant bit (MSB) portion of an indicator; and

a discrete encoding that includes a first indicator and a second indicator.-

Wong fails to disclose plurality of output ports wherein duplications of the packet for each of the output ports controlled by descriptors in the table.

But, Tang et al. discloses replication using pointer and index whereby the index enables the performance of the multicast packet replication destined to (output) ports on VLANs other than the ingress VLAN, column 14, lines 4-14, with the pointer locating the entry in the table for each outgoing VLAN and the index used for selecting the ports of the egress VLAN that should receive the frame, column 14, lines 25-31.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Tang et al.'s limitation because this would have allowed replication process to continue for each outgoing VLAN, column 14, lines 37-38.

The combination of Wong and Tang et al. fails to disclose duplications on a per port basis on at least one of the output ports rather than all of the output ports.

But, Fig. 1 of the Admitted Prior Art in the Background of the application discloses duplication where copy of the packet is sent to a different VLAN and port, ¶ [0003], lines 11-14.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the Fig. 1, of the Admitted Prior Art in the background of the application's limitation because this would have allowed duplication whereby copy is sent to a port rather than multiple copies sent to each port, ¶ [0003], lines 11-15.

And, the combination of Wong and Fig.1 of the Admitted Prior Art of the application fails to disclose one or more descriptor shared among the output ports.

But, Tang et al. discloses for each outgoing VLAN, the pointer locates the entry in the table and the index selects the ports of the egress VLAN, column 14, lines 25-31.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Tang et al.'s limitation because this would have allowed the pointer and the index to perform the replication operation, column 14, lines 5-6.

Again, the combination of Wong and Fig.1 of the Admitted Prior Art of the application fails to disclose encoding range that includes a starting indicator and an ending indicator for one or more descriptors.

But, Tang et al. discloses replication starting from the location referenced by the pointer (start indicator) until it reaches an entry having a control bit (end indicator) that specifies the termination of the replication, column 14, lines 39-42.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Tang et al.'s limitation because this would have allowed the replication process for each outgoing VLAN, column 14, lines 37-38.

And, the combination of Wong, Tang et al. and Fig.1 of the Admitted Prior Art of the application fails to disclose encoding range that includes a most significant bit (MSB) of an indicator.

But, Herriot discloses most significant bit of the encoded character is masked to a range where an indicator corresponds to a range of the character, columns 11-12, lines 64-65, 4-5.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Herriot's limitation because this would have allowed the most significant bit of the encoded character where the indicator corresponds to the range of the character, columns 11-12, lines 64-65, 4-5.

Further, the combination of Wong, Fig.1 of the Admitted Prior Art of the application and Herriot fails to disclose encoding that includes first and second indicators.

But, Tang et al. discloses replication starting from the location referenced by the pointer (first indicator) until it reaches an entry having a control bit (second indicator) that specifies the termination of the replication, column 14, lines 37-42.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the Tang et al.'s limitation because this would have allowed the replication process for each outgoing VLAN, column 14, lines 37-38.

Regarding Claims 2, Wong discloses the packet duplication system, wherein each of the number of duplications is coupled to a Virtual Local Area Network (VLAN) (IPM packet

replication per VLAN, page STN-10, line 8).

Regarding Claims 4, Wong discloses the packet duplication system, wherein the VLAN pointer descriptors arranged in the linked-list table include at least one shared descriptor (IPMC_PTR is the index in the IP multicast group vector table is also the index in the IP multicast VLAN ID table, Replication Flow, page STN-48, lines 1-3).

Regarding Claim 6, Wong discloses the packet duplication system of claim 5, wherein each of the plurality of entries (column of 8 entries in the L3 table, ECMP Dest_Ip Search, step 7, page STN-8) corresponds to one of the plurality of output ports (Block Diagram, CPE egress bus, page STN-2).

Regarding Claims 7, Wong discloses the packet duplication system, wherein the contiguous range encoding includes a starting Virtual Local Area Network (VLAN) indicator (IPMC Replication, VLAN_ID1, step 9, page STN-13) and an ending VLAN indicator (IPMC Replication, VLAN_ID2, step 12, page STN-13).

Regarding Claims 8, Wong discloses the packet duplication system, wherein the non-contiguous range encoding includes a most significant bit (MSB) portion (IPMC Replication, 64-bit vector for specifying the MS (Most Significant) 6 bits of VLAN_ID, page STN-11, lines 11-12) of a Virtual Local Area Network (VLAN) indicator (IPMC Replication, VLAN_ID, page STN-11) and a bitmap (ECMP Dest_Ip Search, step 7, LPM table get 12-bit L3_table_index with

Art Unit: 2462

3-bit count field, page STN-8) decoded from a least significant bit (LSB) portion (ECMP

Dest_Ip Search, step 8, index points to the first entry of column of 8-entries in the L3 table, page STN-8) of the VLAN indicator.

Regarding Claims 9, Wong discloses the packet duplication system, wherein the discrete encoding includes a first Virtual Local Area Network (VLAN) indicator (IPMC Replication, VLAN_ID1, step 9, page STN-13) and a second VLAN indicator (IPMC Replication, VLAN_ID2, step 12, page STN-13).

Regarding Claim 27, Wong discloses the packet duplication system of claim 1, wherein a first descriptor in the linked-list table includes a first link to a second descriptor in the linked-list table.

The combination of Wong, Fig.1 of the Admitted Prior Art of the application and Herriot fails to disclose first descriptor to second descriptor in the table.

But, Tang et al. discloses Fig. 3, the port index becomes the destination index in the table, column 9, lines 64-65.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Tang et al.'s limitation because this would have allowed the port index to become the destination index when there was a hit in the table which responds to the select signals over the switching bus, columns 9 and 10, lines 64-67 and line 1 respectively.

Regarding Claim 28, Wong discloses the packet duplication system of claim 27, wherein the second descriptor in the linked-list table includes a second link to a third descriptor in the linked-list table.

The combination of Wong, Fig.1 of the Admitted Prior Art of the application and Herriot fails to disclose second descriptor to third descriptor in the table.

But, Tang et al. discloses Fig. 3, the destination index is then used to reference an index entry 352 in the table, column 9, lines 65-66.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Tang et al.'s limitation because this would have allowed the destination index to reference the index entry when there was a hit in the table which responds to the select signals over the switching bus, columns 9 and 10, lines 64-67 and line 1 respectively.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 21 and 23-25 would allowable since the closest art Wong, Tang et al., Herriot and the Admitted Prior Art failed to anticipate or render obvious the limitation of these claims.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed August 27, 2010 with respect to claim 1 have been considered, but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection as necessitated by the amendment to the claims.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leon Andrews whose telephone number is (571) 270-1801. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:30 AM to 5:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rao S. Seema can be reached on (571) 272-3174. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Seema S. Rao/

Application/Control Number: 10/687,784
Art Unit: 2462

Page 11

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit
2462

LA/la
September 8, 2010